*Watching an Equilibrium Die*

Benjamin James

May 18, 2026

Our standard vocabulary of strategic analysis is built from a small set of primitives. Interest, balance, deterrence, alliance, equilibrium. These primitives have served well for most of the postwar period. They predict well enough when systems are stable and accurately explain, after the fact, when systems are not.

Their limitation is more specific than imprecision. It is structural. Our vocabulary treats coordination as a consequence of interest, agents cooperate when it serves them or defect when defecting serves them more, and treats the breakdown of coordination as the visible result of interest realigning. This makes the frame predictively sharp in periods when the underlying structure of an arrangement is intact and only its surface negotiations are in motion. It also makes the frame nearly useless in periods when the underlying structure itself is being reorganized, because the classical frame possesses no concept for structure as such. It has nouns for agents and verbs for their actions; it lacks a vocabulary for the property that allows those arrangement to persist.

Call this property coupling, provisionally. It is the second-order condition under which an arrangement remains an arrangement; it is the configuration in which each agent's continued participation makes every other agent's continued participation more, rather than less, sustainable. Coupling is not the same as alignment of interest. Interests are first-order, comparable across agents, exchangeable for each other. Coupling is a feature of the field that interests inhabit. It can be high or low independently of whether the interests themselves are converging or diverging. It can fail without any single interest changing.

The classical frame cannot register coupling because it lacks a primitive for it. It can describe a state defecting, a treaty being broken, or an alliance fracturing. It cannot describe the prior structural property whose loss made the defection coherent for the defector. It will, when pressed, narrate the same outcome from the interior of each agent's preferences (the defector's interests changed, the treaty was no longer in their net favor) and produce an account that is locally accurate at every node but globally vacant. The narrative loses the very thing one would want to know, why all these interests are now changing at the same time, in the same direction, across systems no analyst's model previously coupled.

This is why the present moment, viewed through the classical eye, dissolves into a coincidence of unrelated crises. The Iran war has its own logic of regional power competition. The Hormuz closure has its own logic of energy economics and tanker insurance. The UAE's departure from OPEC has its own logic of bilateral grievance and post-peak-demand positioning. The umbrella-credibility collapse has its own logic of populist domestic politics. The war-powers inversion has its own logic of partisan polarization. Each event is internally explicable. Nothing about any of them seems to require the others. The cumulative pattern dissolves into noise, which is to say, the classical framework receiving the pattern has no register in which the pattern is signal.

The first move of this essay is not to refute the classical frame. It is to mark precisely what it cannot perceive, so that perception itself can be located and held. What is being lost is not a treaty, an alliance, a market structure, or an institution. What is being lost is a second-order property that several of those things were quietly relying on. Naming it is the only way to see it dying.

An arrangement is stable, when it is stable, for one of two reasons. Either each party is prevented from defection by some external force, such as the contract model, held in place by something outside the contract, or each party's restraint actively reinforces the others'. In the second case, the arrangement is held in place by its own activity.

Consider the nonproliferation treaty in its functioning form. The NPT was never primarily a contract held in place by external sanction. Sanctions existed, Security Council mechanisms existed, but the operative property was elsewhere. Each non-nuclear signatory's continued restraint made every other signatory's restraint cheaper to sustain because the field of credible threats they faced was thinner when those threats did not include their immediate neighbors, because their own legitimacy gained from participating in a structure their peers participated in, and because the umbrella that protected them was less stressed when fewer demanded protection. Restraint reinforced restraint. The arrangement was its own gradient.

Verification, viewed this way, is not enforcement. It is the apparatus through which each agent can confirm that the others are still in the configuration they claim. The IAEA does not punish; it lets every signatory observe, with bounded latency, that every other signatory remains in compliance, that the gradient is still pointing in the direction each agent's restraint depends on. Strip verification and the gradient remains in principle, but no agent can confirm its direction. Restraint loses its informational warrant. Compliance becomes costly not because compliance has changed, but because the apparatus that made compliance legible has been removed.

An umbrella guarantee, similarly, is not what its name suggests. It is not a promise of action under future contingency, no such promise is enforceable across decades and administrations. It is a continuously-updated estimate, held by every protected party, of how the umbrella-holder will behave under stress. The estimate is informed by what the holder says, by what the holder has done in past situations of comparable shape, by how it is treating other parties now, by the institutional architecture inside the holder's own state. Each protected party's restraint is calibrated to its current estimate. The umbrella's value lies not in any commitment text but in the stability of the estimate across the protected population.

What such an arrangement is, structurally, is a living gradient, an attractor toward which agents are drawn because being in it makes their own coherence cheaper to maintain than the alternatives. It is not a place one is held. It is a place one falls into, because the surrounding field slopes that way. This is why such arrangements survive perturbations that look, from outside, as if they should be terminal. A signatory enriches above limits, an ally publicly questions the arrangement, or a satellite state tests its margins, and the gradient corrects. The defector is pulled back, contained, or absorbed into a renegotiated configuration. The system self-restores, not because anyone is enforcing it, but because the slope of the field, in the absence of structural damage, points back toward the attractor.

What such structures cannot survive is a perturbation that destroys the apparatus of slope. A defection within a coupled field is recoverable; a defection that ablates the coupling itself is not. The first kind of perturbation tests the arrangement; the second kind ends it. The classical eye, which sees only the agents and their actions, will not distinguish between the two until long after the distinction has become irrelevant.

This is the recursive game theory lens, not as theory, which can be argued for or against, but as a way of seeing, which once in use cannot be turned off. With it, the events of the present moment begin to organize themselves differently. The question in front of us is no longer which arrangements are breaking. It is which arrangements were coupled in the first place, and what has been happening, structurally, to that coupling.

Consider what happens when a single agent inside a coupled equilibrium decides, for whatever reason, to maximize its own local coherence by force. The act, if successful, produces a real and visible gain. The agent's first-order coherence rises, often dramatically in the short window after the act, because force at scale does that. Targets are destroyed. Competitors are removed. The signal is loud. Domestic legitimacy compounds, at least temporarily. The gain is not illusory. It is bounded, but real, and it is the part of the action the actor sees.

The part the actor does not see is the second action layered inside the first. To use force against a position inside the field is also to operate on the field. The act is a pruning move, and pruning is only structurally legitimate when what is being pruned was itself draining future adaptive capacity. Dead branches, obsolete commitments, and attractors that no longer attract, these must be cut, and healthy systems cut them constantly. Coercion against a coupled position does the opposite. It severs the structures that were sustaining future capacity in exchange for an immediate local payoff. What is cut is load-bearing.

The signature of this move is not in what the coercer gains. The local gain is what gets reported. The signature is what happens inside every other agent in the field, simultaneously. Each one recursively re-rates its own estimate of the coercer, and those re-ratings propagate at the speed of attention. Agents who were not the target of the act, who were not consulted about it, who were not parties to its justification, all update at once. The coercer's first-order gain is preserved, but the network's coupling has been damaged. The coercer cannot yet see the second-order cost because it has not yet arrived.

This is structurally identical to deception. Not because the coercer was lying, the coercer may have been entirely candid, may have stated intentions plainly, or may have given justifications a tribunal would accept, but because what the act signaled to the network is information about the coercer that cannot now be retracted. A state that has demonstrated it will sever coupling for local gain is, after the demonstration, a state that demonstrably severs coupling for local gain. The information is in the field. There is no version of next month in which it is not.

The first collapse to walk under our lens is nonproliferation. The coupling involved was unusually clean; it has been codified, instrumented, audited by an agency whose entire purpose was gradient-tracking, and stabilized by the most expensive deterrent commitments any state has ever made.

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons has held together for fifty-five years because each non-nuclear signatory's restraint was kept legible to every other signatory by the inspection apparatus of the IAEA, and because the umbrella guarantees of the recognized nuclear states made staying inside the arrangement structurally cheaper than building one's own deterrent. The signatories did the rest by doing nothing.

The coercion move came on February 28, 2026. The United States and Israel launched coordinated strikes on Iranian military, government, and nuclear targets during active Oman-mediated negotiations on a renewed nuclear agreement. The Iranian Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei was killed within the first hour. Several members of his family were killed alongside him. The Iranian command

architecture was decapitated. Within seventy-two hours, Iran had withdrawn from inspection cooperation, restricted its remaining contacts with the IAEA, and moved its enriched-uranium stockpile to facilities the agency had no means of reaching.

The local gain was real and substantial. Khamenei was dead. The Iranian leadership succession was forced under conditions chosen by the strikers. Enrichment infrastructure was damaged. Iranian retaliation, though aggressive, was bounded by depleted air defenses and missile-launch capacity destroyed in the opening salvos. By any classical accounting, the operation succeeded.

The second-order cost was the verification gradient itself. The IAEA's inspectors lost access not through defiant expulsion in the way nonproliferation discourse usually imagines, but because the agency withdrew them for safety, because the facilities they would have inspected no longer existed in inspectable form, because the agreements under which inspections proceeded had been overtaken by a state of war. The apparatus that made every other threshold state's compliance legible was no longer in operation, not because anyone violated it, but because the conditions under which it could operate had been destroyed. Iran's subsequent non-cooperation merely formalized what was already structural.

This is the move whose second cost has not yet arrived in full. Every threshold state in the international system observed, in a single compressed window, that a state negotiating in apparent good faith with American mediators and signing inspection agreements with the IAEA could be struck by surprise, mid-negotiation, with the explicit goal of removing its leadership. The lesson is not subtle. Compliance during negotiation is not a coherent position. Latency, being technically capable of weaponization while choosing not to weaponize and is the position the entire nonproliferation architecture asked of every signatory, was shown, in real time, to be the configuration most exposed to preventive force. The verdict on latency is universal because every state with the relevant technical capacity received it at the same time.

What followed was not a sequence of independent decisions. It was a phase reorganization of the field. The Trump administration finalized a 123 Agreement with Saudi Arabia stripped of the gold-standard prohibition on enrichment. South Korea was granted authorization to enrich uranium domestically to twenty percent. The Turkish foreign ministry publicly invoked the asymmetry between nuclear-eligible Western states and proscribed non-Western ones; Erdogan-aligned media published essays arguing the NPT discriminates against Muslim states. Japan, characteristically quiet, began discreet recalibration of its plutonium economics. France announced the first stockpile

increase by a P5 state in a generation. Each move is intelligible in isolation. In the field, they are one signal.

The NPT did not die because anyone violated it. The treaty text remains in force. The signatures remain affixed. The annual meetings will continue. The NPT died because the apparatus that made compliance legible was demonstrated to be a pruning target, because the structure on which restraint depended could be unilaterally cut by the most powerful state in the system, and was. Restraint in a coupling-stripped configuration is no longer the cheaper path.

What we are watching is an equilibrium in the months after its coupling structure has been killed but before its new attractor has appeared. The signatories are not in the old arrangement and not yet in the new one. They are moving, quietly, deniably, in the language of civil energy and strategic autonomy, toward a configuration that will, in three to five years, be visible as the new equilibrium. We do not yet know what it looks like. We know it will not be the previous one.

Cross now to a domain whose surface vocabulary shares nothing with the previous one. Different actors. Different stakes. Different timescales. Markets rather than ministries, tankers rather than centrifuges, barrels rather than warheads. My argument is that the structural anatomy is identical.

What was coupled, before February 2026, was not a treaty. It was four arrangements running in parallel and reinforcing one another: the inventory buffers held by major economies against demand shocks; the strategic petroleum reserves held against geopolitical shocks; OPEC and OPEC+ coordination as a cartel-stabilization layer that throttled supply against price collapse; and freedom-of-navigation through the Strait of Hormuz as the substrate guarantee on which the other three depended. None of these is a contract. Together they constituted an arrangement that absorbed perturbations and stayed in configuration. That was the coupling.

The coercion sequence began on February 28. Iran closed the Strait of Hormuz in response to the strikes described previously; this was, on its own terms, a coercion move from the Iranian side. What was structurally distinctive was the American response. Rather than de-escalation, the United States imposed a counter-blockade on Iranian shipping on April 13, ensuring the chokepoint stayed closed from both sides. The strategic petroleum reserve has since been drained at a record pace, faster than any prior administration by margins that made the prior record look gradual.

On May 1, the United Arab Emirates quietly departed OPEC and OPEC+. This is the philosophically critical event of the sequence, and it has been almost entirely under-read. The UAE exit is not an oil-market footnote. It is the formal demonstration that the coordination assumption on which the cartel has operated for sixty years no longer holds, and that an agent positioned to extract maximum value

from the rupture has explicitly chosen to do so. The UAE had spare capacity it had been holding back under quota; with the cartel's coupling visibly broken, the rents from defection now exceed the rents from cooperation. The exit is what defection looks like when an agent stops pretending cooperation is still in play.

As in the nonproliferation case, the local payoffs are real. American producers are exporting at record volumes. Brazilian and Atlantic Basin output is filling the gaps. The UAE will gain substantial market share through 2027. The administration can claim a strong domestic energy position and a public posture of pressure on Iran. The classical accounting registers a win.

The second-order cost is the buffer itself. OECD on-land inventories that absorbed every geopolitical shock since the 1970s are being depleted at rates the system cannot sustain past a small number of months without entering operational fuel rationing, a condition the developed world has not encountered in a generation. Asian buyers, observing the rupture, are restructuring their sourcing graphs toward suppliers outside the Persian Gulf in ways that will not be undone on ceasefire; trade relationships, once rerouted, carry switching costs that compound. Refining margins are repricing on a new and permanent volatility floor. Insurance, war-risk premia, and shipping contract structures are absorbing the new regime as a parameter, not an event.

The 1973 analogue lies not in the price spike. The 1973 analogue would be if, during the OPEC embargo, the Saudi-American coordination structure itself had been ablated. The price spike of 1973 was severe; the system absorbed it because the coupling held. What is happening now is the inverse. The price spike is moderate by historical standards, but the coupling that absorbs spikes is being consumed in real time. Same anatomy, different domain.

Move now to the third collapse, the one most observers are not yet treating as structurally equivalent to the previous two, because it occurs inside one of the actors rather than between them. The inversion of the United States war-powers architecture.

The War Powers Resolution of 1973 has never been a clean mechanism. It is imperfect, repeatedly contested, and routinely circumvented by administrations of both parties. But it is, in our lens's terms, a coupling between the executive's discretion over the use of force, the legislature's constitutional authorization function, and the electorate's revocation capacity at the ballot. Each component constrains the others not by formal enforcement but by the continuous expectation that the others will act when the configuration demands it. The resolution was never the apparatus; it was the visible part of an apparatus that operated mostly in expectations.

Across 2025 and into 2026, the United States Senate took up war-powers resolutions seeking to limit the Iran engagement on seven separate occasions. All seven were rejected. The repetition is the signal. A single failed vote is consistent with normal disagreement; seven failed votes across a single ongoing conflict is a public demonstration that the constraint is no longer operative. It is the legislative-roll-call equivalent of a verification regime that no longer verifies; the apparatus continues to convene, motions continue to be filed, the institutional ritual remains, and the gradient on which the apparatus depended is no longer there.

This must be stated clearly. The structural claim is not about our current officeholders. It would be the same claim if a different administration were running the same engagement. A state has now demonstrated, in legislative-roll-call form, that its internal coupling between branches is non-binding under conditions of ongoing kinetic engagement. Whether one approves of the engagement is irrelevant to the structural observation. The constraint was the load-bearing element; the constraint was shown not to bear load.

The deeper move, which our lens permits and the classical eye does not, is to recognize that the umbrella-credibility collapse and the war-powers collapse are not two events. They are the same event, observed from two angles. An umbrella guarantee is a continuously-updated estimate, and that estimate is informed by whether the holder's own internal structures can be relied on to constrain its behavior. When a state demonstrates that its internal coupling between branches is non-binding, every external agent that was rating its commitments recursively updates downward, because the architecture that was supposed to make those commitments durable has been shown not to function.

The same move that prunes external coupling also prunes internal coupling. They are not separate prunings. The coercer's domestic coupling fails for the same structural reason its alliance coupling fails; the move that disregards the field also disregards the parts of the field it occupies internally. The move itself is the message. No external agent needs to be told. No domestic institution needs to be formally weakened. The signal has already arrived.

Three collapses have been walked under our lens; five, if umbrella-credibility and the UAE departure are counted separately, as classical analysis does and structural analysis does not. The anatomy is identical in each case. A stable arrangement held in place by its own coupling. A unilateral move by one agent to maximize local coherence by force. A real first-order gain. A second-order rupture in the coupling apparatus, often invisible at the moment it occurs. An incoherence cascade through the

network of agents who were dependent on the apparatus and recursively re-rate their positions in light of its loss.

Classical analysis cannot recognize this as one event because the vocabulary lacks a primitive for second-order coupling dynamics. One can describe each collapse in interest-based terms, Iran's leadership was a strategic threat, Hormuz traffic was a contested resource, war-powers limitation conflicted with executive prerogative, and produce a complete-seeming explanation for each. The explanations are not wrong. They are accurate at every node and silent about the configuration that connects them. Taken together, the five accurate narratives miss the property that makes their simultaneity not coincidence.

Here is the philosophical claim our lens permits, kept brief and weight-bearing. The strategic and the ethical are not separate categories at long enough time horizons. They are the same property observed at different temporal depths. An action that produces local coherence at the cost of structural coupling is strategically incoherent on precisely the grounds on which it is ethically incoherent; both descriptions are tracking the same underlying property, the foreclosure of futures. The strategist's complaint that the action sacrifices long-term position for short-term gain, and the ethicist's complaint that the action treats others as instrumental to one's immediate ends, name the same structural failure. The convergence is not coincidence. It is what the property looks like from inside and from outside the agent committing the act.

The present moment is unusually clarifying because the costs are arriving fast enough that this convergence is becoming legible to observers who do not normally think in coherence terms. Strategic-realist analysts and rights-based ethicists are converging on the same diagnosis from opposite poles, often without recognizing each other as allies. Convergence is recursive coherence game theory’s prediction.

A theory that cannot be falsified is not a theory. What follows is what is most at risk, predictions concrete enough to be wrong on timescales already in motion.

Classical proliferation analysis treats threshold-state transitions as decadal events, individually decided, and individually negotiable. Our lens predicts otherwise. Multiple threshold states will move toward weapons-relevant capabilities within an 18- to 24-month window from the date of the verification gradient's destruction. Not over decades. Within months. The moves will be coordinated only in their simultaneity; no agent will need to consult another, because each is observing the same field and updating against the same losses.

The order will be consistent with coherence-sensitivity rather than capability. Saudi Arabia will move first and most openly, because its sensitivity to the broken field is lowest and its rents from defection highest. Turkey will move next, with public rhetorical justification, because its political coherence is partly constituted by symbolic alignment against Western asymmetry. South Korea will move more carefully, hedged in civilian-energy language, with the technical capacity already long-established and only the political threshold remaining. Japan will move last and most quietly, because its coherence-sensitivity is highest; it will exhaust every alternative before crossing.

Coalitions will reorganize along coupling lines rather than alliance lines. Independent European deterrence is already emerging; France's stockpile announcement was the leading edge, not the trailing tail. An Indo-Pacific defensive cluster will form among Japan, South Korea, Australia, and possibly India, increasingly decoupled from the American umbrella even where formal alliance language is preserved. A Sunni coherence cluster will deepen around Saudi-Pakistan-Turkey, drawing on the September 2025 Saudi-Pakistan defense agreement as its initial scaffold. These groupings will not be announced. They will be observed.

In commodity markets, a permanent volatility floor will replace the pre-2026 mean. Insurance, reinsurance, and shipping contract structures will reprice on the assumption that the Gulf is a high-risk corridor for the foreseeable future, not just for the duration of any ceasefire. Refining capacity will reorganize toward configurations less dependent on Persian Gulf feedstocks. The "1973 with bigger numbers" framing will fade as it becomes evident that the volatility itself has changed regimes, not just its current value.

The prediction that is harder to make, because it is the one no observer wants to be right about, is that the probability of a catalytic event during a phase transition is structurally elevated above the steady-state rate, because the attractor landscape is in motion and perturbations produce unpredictable responses. The relevant possibilities include nuclear detonation, accidental or otherwise; large-scale cyber-physical incidents; sudden cascading economic events triggered by a chokepoint failure no one was watching. This framework does not say which. It says the probability has risen, and that institutional cognition trained on steady-state expectations will be late to recognize the elevation. The next eighteen months will tell.

The diagnosis offered here is not that the United States is wrong. That is true and refusing to say it would be a violation of its own kind. The deeper diagnosis is that no public language exists for what is occurring. The collapses are perceived one at a time, explained one at a time, and lost as

connected phenomena one at a time, because our dominant strategic vocabulary cannot register the property they share.

The strategic problem of the moment is not any single crisis. It is that the institutional cognition of our era cannot perceive the one event underlying the five, and cannot therefore organize a response at the appropriate level. A coherence-blind public discourse will continue producing post-hoc explanations for each new rupture as if it were the first, while the structure beneath them continues reorganizing itself out of view. Eventually a perturbation will arrive that no analyst was watching for, because no analyst had the vocabulary to anticipate where it would come from.

The work of seeing what is happening must be done now, in the months when seeing it is still possible without consequences that foreclose our seeing. After the new attractor is established, after the cascade has run, this framework becomes a description of what has already happened. The window in which our lens does useful work is the window in which the equilibrium is dying and not yet dead. The equilibrium is dying. The question is whether anyone will name it before what replaces it is named for us.

**References**

James, B. (2025). *The End of Utility: a Coherence-Centric Game Theory for Intelligent Systems*. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMTEO-26